UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,250	09/15/2003	Steve Sorem	72167.000547	6949

21967   7590   01/13/2010

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
DAGNEW, SABA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3688	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 September 2009</u>.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-69</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-69</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

This action is in reply to the amendment filed on 30 September 2009. Claims 1,

25, 44, 50, 59, 60 and 61 have been amended.   Claims 1-69 are currently pending and

have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 50-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to

nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 50 is a method claim and as such must pass the "machine or

transformation test". In accordance with the M-or-T test, the claimed process must: (1)

be tied to a particular machine or apparatus (machine implemented); or (2) particularly

transform a particular article to a different state or thing. A method claim that does not

require machine implementation or does not cause a transformation will fail the test and

should be rejected under § 101. However, the mere presence of a machine tie or

transformation is not sufficient to pass the test.   When a machine tie or transformation

has been identified, it must be further determined that the tie is to a particular machine

or the particular transformation is of a particular article. Additionally, the particular

machine tie or particular transformation must meet two corollaries to pass the test for

subject matter eligibility. First, the use of the particular machine or transformation of the particular article must impose a meaningful limit on the claim's scope. So, a machine tie in only a field-of-use limitation would not be sufficient. Second, the use of the particular machine or the transformation of the particular article must involve more than insignificant "extra-solution" activity. If the machine or transformation is only present in a field-of-use limitation or in a step that is only insignificant "extra-solution" activity, the claim fails the M-or-T test, despite the presence of a machine or a transformation in the claim.

While these claims calls for "storing such new candidate codes in the database...., which may require a machine, note that under the broadest reasonable interpretation no other step requires a machine. Further, the storing step is not central to the purpose of the method invented by the applicant and is insignificant extra-solution activity. Finally, there is no transformation and therefor the methods are not eligible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims **61-69 are** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,106).

With respect to claim 61, Walker teaches a transaction processing and tracking

system comprising:

at least one front-end service providing at least one product bearing a code that

uniquely identifies said product *(Col. 2, lines 51-53, which teaches receiving data*

identifying the first product code);

at least one back-end service communicatively coupled to said at least one front-

end service *(Col. 4, lines 1-5, which teaches a communication link between personal*

computer (front-end) and Central controller (back-end) via internet) ; and,

at least one account, associated with a user, including at least one pre-defined

purse suitable for use in the transaction, wherein said at least one account is

communicatively coupled to said at least one front-end service *(Fig. 7A, which teaches*

user/buyer log-on 114, and receiving user/buyer information including credit card

number (account) and Col. 5, lines 4-14, which teaches establishing an account for

user/buyer);

wherein said at least one product is transacted in exchange for multiple resource

types included in said account by interacting with said account in accordance with an

agreed value of said at least one product *(Col. 7, lines 30-45, which teaches*

processing pre-paid gift certificate (product) and transmitting transaction to a credit card

issuer for authorization); and

wherein said at least one product is exchanged for multiple ones of the multiple

resource types, and accordingly said account is interacted with *(Col. 7, lines 30-45,*

which teaches processing pre-paid gift certificate (product) and transmitting transaction

*to a credit card issuer for authorization and **Col. 8, lines 58-66,** which teaches pre-paid*

gift certificate value redeemed and track and charged appropriately to the various

authorized account), and wherein further the user can transfer value from the at least

one account associated with the user to at least one account belonging to a second

user *(Col. 11, lines 15-26, where "returning the change to the buyer via his credit card*

account" reads on transferring value from one account to the second account).

With respect to claims 62 and 63, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements

of claim 61, furthermore, Walker teaches the method, wherein the communicative

coupled comprises a known communication network *(Col. 4, lines 1-5, which teaches*

connecting via internet (network)).

With respect to claim 64, Walker teaches the system wherein said at least on

front-end service includes at least one of merchant financial resource, service providers,

and business partners *(Col. 7, lines 46- 49, where "bank" reads on financial resource).*

With respect to claim 65, Walker teaches all elements of claim 61, furthermore,

Walker teaches the method wherein said at least one back-end service includes at least

one of a server and software resource *(Col. 4, lines 1-22, where "buyer/redeemer*

*interface" reads on software and **Col. 4, lines 37-43**, teaches "control programs and*

Certificate redemption program" reads on software and server is inherent) and

consumer account *(Col. 5, lines 4-8, which teach account established).*

With respect to claim 66-69, Walker teaches all elements of claim 61,

furthermore, Walker teaches wherein transactions include value based transactions,

interacting includes debit, credit *(Col. 4, line 67, and Col. 5, 1-3, which teaches debit*

and credit transaction) and value chaining *(Col. 11, lines 19-20, which teaches direct*

refund) .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **1-17, 24-25, 28-38, 44-50, and 54-60 are** rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over **Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,106) in view**

of Humble (US Patent No. 4,949,256).

With respect to claims 1, 25, 44, 50 and 59-60 Walker teaches a method for

tracking promotion at least one group products, a remote station for tracking valuation, a

system, and method of at least one of a group of products, method comprises:

wherein each product of the group bears a code that uniquely identifies each

product in the group *(Col. 2, lines 60-67, teaches plurlity of products codes for*

identifying products and each of the product prices corresponding to one of the product

codes) and each product of the group is substantially identical type *(Col. 6, lines 7-10,*

which teaches gift certificate codes, where "gift certificate" is substantially identical type)

communicatively coupling a remote station to a user station **(Fig. 1, and Col. 4,**

lines 1-12, *where "personal computer" reads on user station and "central controller 2"*

reads on a remote station);

providing a database at the remote station *(Fig. 2, teaches four databases 26-32*

Fig. 3 and Col. 4, lines 23-27, *where " central controller 12" connected to "storage*

device" reads on database);

storing in the database ones of the uniquely identifying codes that have been

previously received from one or more user stations *(Fig. 4, where "item code" reads on*

*uniquely identifying code **and Col. 2, lines 40-67,** where teaches processor receiving*

data identifying the first product code).

Walker teaches all the above elements except comparing each new candidate

code received from a given user station against the previously received codes stored in

the database, crediting an account of a user associated with the given user station with

a non-zero promotional credit when such new candidate code received from the given

user station was not previously stored in the database and storing such new candidate

code in the database as a previously received code if such new candidate code was not

previously stored in the database.

However, Humble teaches comparing, using a computer processor, each new

candidate code received from a given user station against the previously received

codes stored in the database *(Col. 4, lines 10-21, which teaches reading (receiving)*

encoded card that uniquely identifies coupon, compare received coupon with a local file

(database) of redeemable coupons) and crediting an account of a user associated with

the given user station with a non-zero promotional credit <u>when</u> such new candidate

code received from the given user station was not previously stored in the database

(Col. 3, lines32-42, which teach crediting customer account for later use and 54-67,

which teach compare received coupon with local file and accumulating credit value) and

storing such new candidate code in the database as a previously received code if such

new candidate code was not previously stored in the database *(Col. 4, lines 1-5,*

updating local database by adding coupons , where "presented and validated" reads on

received new candidate code) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to the one

ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to add coupon validation

network as taught by Humble in the system of Walker in order to validate coupon

automatically for later redemption credit (see Humble, *Col. 2, lines 56-59).*

With respect to claim 2, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claim

1, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said database further includes at

least one permissible new candidate code *(Fig. 2, 28, which teaches gift certificate code*

database and Fig. 5, code number 72, allowable candidate code), and

wherein the at least one permissible new candidate code may be provided by a

provider of the ones in the group *(Fig. 7A, 128 and Col. 6, lines 23-34, where teaches*

"merchant been established gift items" candidate code may be provided by provider

Col. 6, lines 65-67, *where "a gift code central controller 12" reads on provider provided*

a gift code *and Col. 7, lines 1-5)* and

wherein said database server compares each new candidate code against the at

least one permissible new candidate code *(Col. 11, lines 35-47, which teaches*

examine to identify records)

With respect to claims 3 Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims

1 and 2, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein the non-zero valuation credit

may be not credited if the new candidate code doesn't match one of the at least one

permissible new candidate codes *(Fig. 7A, 140, which teaches credit card code doesn't*

match, it passes an error message such as " invalid account")

With respect to claims 4, and 9, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements

of claims 1 and 3, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein there are at least

two groups, and wherein each group may be provided by a different provider **(Fig. 5, 82,**

multiple seller ID number shows that there are more than provider**)** .

With respect to claims 5, and 10 Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements

of claims1, 2, 3, 4 and 9, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said

database server maintains separate previously received codes and separate

permissible new candidate codes for each provider *(Fig. 2, and Col. 4, lines 23-35,*

which teaches maintaining a separate database).

With respect to claims 6 and 32, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements

of claims 1 and 25, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said database

may be resident on a network server at the remote station *(Fig. 2, and Col. 4, lines 23-43*, which teaches storage device 22, contain for databases) .*

With respect to claims 7, and 33, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims 1, 6, 25, 32 and 61, furthermore, Walker teaches the method, wherein the communicative coupling may be an internet connection *(Col. 4, lines 1-5, which teaches connecting via internet).*

With respect to claim 8, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claim 1; furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said database server includes one account associated with each user to correspond to one group for the crediting of the non-zero valuation credit *(Col. 11, lines 18-26,* where "direct refund" reads on crediting *non-zero valuation credit)*

With respect to claims 11, 34, 46 and 55, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims 1, 25, 44 and 50, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said database server, upon storing a previously received code, further stores the previously received code as a consumed code *(Fig. 5 and Col. 5, lines 48-55*, which teaches gift certificate "filled/redeemed" reads on consumed)*

With respect to claims 12, 35, 47 and 56 Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims 1, 11, 25, 34, 44, 46, 50 and 55, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein the consumed code cannot be entered as a previously received code by a subsequent user *(Col. 8, lines 5662,* which teaches cancelling as expired).*

With respect to claims 13-17, and 36-38 Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims 1 and 25 Walker teaches a method wherein the uniquely identifying code may be a UPC, SPIF, numeric, alphabetic and alpha-numeric *(Fig. 4, 62 , where "item code" reads on unique code, which is numeric Fig. 5, 72, where teaches alpha-numeric code)* .

With respect to claim 24, Walker in view of Humble teaches all element of claim 1, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein a credit certificate may be issued to the user account once a pre set value of non-zero valuation credits may be accumulated in the user account *(Col. 8, lines 56-64, where "redeemer/user submit accumulated initial code value" reads on non-zero valuation credit may be accumulated).*

With respect to claims 28, 48 and 57, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claim 25, 44 and 50, furthermore, Walker teaches the method wherein said database further includes at least one permissible new candidate code, and wherein the at least one permissible new candidate code may be provided by a provider of the certificates in the group *(Col. 8, lines 8-19, which teaches gift certificate code generated and mailed to customer by the credit card issuer)* and wherein said database server compares each new candidate code against the at least one permissible new candidate code (*Col. 8, lines 12-19, which teaches direction are provided, where customer to contact to activate the code, and the controller compares and issue authorization).*

With respect to claim 29, Walker in view of Humble addressed by the rejection of claim 3 as cited above.

With respect to claim 30-31, Walker in view of Humble addressed by the rejection of claims 4 and 5 as cited above.

With respect to claims 45 and 54 Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of claims 44 and 50, furthermore, teaches Walker the method of further comprising receiving at the remote station from the user station the new candidate code prior to said comparing *(Col. 3, lines 4-8, which teaches receiving data identifying product code)*.

With respect to claim 49, Walker in view of Humble addressed by the rejection of claim 3 as cited above.

With respect to claim 58, Walker in view of Humble addressed by the rejection of clams 1 and 2 as cited above.

Claims 18-22, 26-27, 39-42, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,106) in view of Humble (US Patent No. 4,949,256) and further view of Official Notice.

With respect to claim 18, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of clam 1, except new candidate code may be placed under a peel off label. However, the examiner takes an official notice that it's old and well known in the art to place a product

code under peel off label to remove the label from the product easily. For example,

peeling off the piece of paper affixed from the product. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to the one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a peel of

label feature in order to remove the code from the product.

With respect to claims 19-22 and 39-42, Walker in view of Humble teaches all

elements of claims 1 and 25, including a user input device such as a keyboard to type

the new candidate code into an internet browser *(Col. 4, lines 1- 5)*, but Walker does

not explicitly teaches a code reader. However, the examiner takes an official notice that

it's old and well known in the art that to have code reader for tracking asset and

inventory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the one ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to add code reader feature in order to minimize cost.

With respect to claims 26, and 51, Walker in view of Humble teaches all

elements of claims 25, and 50 including buyer is a register user *(Col. 6, lines 39-40)* ,

but Walker does not explicitly teaches that the user may be a retailer. Therefore,

official notice taken it is well known in the art at the time the invention was made to add

seller of the certificate as a customer of the product of the manufacturer because a

seller of the gift certificate is allowing its customer to buy a manufacture's product to

generate higher revenue and to give flexible process for the redeemer.

With respect to claims 27, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of

claim 25 and 26, furthermore, Walker teaches the method, wherein the account credited

may be a retailer's account, and wherein the non-zero certificate credit may be

equivalent to a purchase value for the certificate *(Col. 5, line 1-3, which teaches "a card*

number stored in being debited for at purchase for a pre-paid certificate)

With respect to claim 52, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements of

claims 50 and 51, furthermore, Walker teaches the method further comprising

exchanging, by the retailer, of at least one product of value equivalent to the gift

certificate for the gift certificate, prior to said comparing *(Fig. 5, 70D, which teaches*

initial value is equal to remaining code value and Col. 2, lines 34-39, where "selecting

a gift within a value of the certificate" reads on product value equivalent to the gift

certificate)

With respect to claim 53, Walker in view of Humble addressed by the rejection of

claim 27 as cited above.

Claims 23, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,106) in view of Humble (US

Patent No. 4,949,256) and further view of Dodd (U.S. Patent No. 6, 321, 211).

With respect to claims 23 and 43, Walker in view of Humble teaches all elements

of claims 1 and 25, including redeeming and receiving a gift certificate codes via internet

(Col. 8, lines 39-46). However, Walker in view of Humble does not teach the method

wherein a web browser may be resident on the remote station and the user station.

Dodd teaches the method wherein a web browser may be resident on the remote

station and the user station *(Col. 3, lines 28-36, which teaches user/gift giver uses*

browser to select online gift for the recipient). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

the one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invitation was made to add Todd's

browser software feature in the system of Walker and Humble in order to click when the

hyperlink contacted with the gift server *(Todd, Col. 11, lines 24-25)*

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 30 September 2009 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Due to the amendment, the claim objection for claims 1, 25, 44, 50, 59, 60 and

61 have been withdrawn.

Due to the applicant amendment 35 U.S.C 101 rejections for claims 44-49 have

been withdrawn, however the 35 U.S.C 101 rejections for claims 50-58 is maintained.

Applicant argued in pages 19-21 that Walker fails to disclose each one of each

group bears a code that uniquely identifies each on in the group and each one in the

group is substantially identical in type.   Additionally, applicant's argued that Humble

fails to disclose any arrangement of the database and fails to disclose that each of the

group is substantially identical type.

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because While

Walker's reference teaches each one of each group bears a code that uniquely

identifies each on in the group *(Col. 2 , lines 60-67, teaches plurlity of products codes*

for identifying products and each of the product prices corresponding to one of the

product codes, in the above citation Walker specially shows that identifying a product by

its product code and each product price associated with its product code) and each one

in the group is substantially identical in type *(Col. 6, lines 7-10, which teaches gift*

certificate codes, where "gift certificate" is substantially identical type, Walker

reference's shows a gift certificates with its identification code, which identifying a gift

certificates contain identification code, and gift certificate is an identical type product)

Humble teaches comparing, using a computer processor, each new candidate code

received from a given user station against the previously received codes stored in the

database *(Col. 4, lines 10-21, which teaches reading (receiving) encoded card that*

uniquely identifies coupon, compare received coupon with a local file (database) of

redeemable coupons) and crediting an account of a user associated with the given user

station with a non-zero promotional credit when such new candidate code received from

the given user station was not previously stored in the database *(Col. 3, lines32-42,*

which teach crediting customer account for later use and 54-67, which teach compare

received coupon with local file and accumulating credit value) and storing such new

candidate code in the database as a previously received code if such new candidate

code was not previously stored in the database *(Col. 4, lines 1-5, updating local*

database by adding coupons , where "presented and validated" reads on received new

candidate code).

Even though, the examiner addressed the claimed element by the above citation,

claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but

does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a

claim to a particular structure (MPEP § 2111.04). Accordingly, the following optional

claim language in claims 1, 25, 44, 50, 59 and 60 was not given patentable weight:

" when such new candidate code received from the given user station was not

previously stored in the database"

While the Examiner addresses the optional limitation in this action, it is the

Examiner's opinion that these limitations do not distinguish the claim from the prior art.

See MPEP 2106 II C (Paragraph 4+).

Therefore, the above reasons its dependent claims remain rejected.

Applicant in pages 21-23 argued that applicant has amended claim 61 to recite,

inter alia, "wherein further the user can transfer value from the at least one account

associated with the user to at least line account belonging to a second user."   Waller

fails to disclose this element, either alone or in combination with the other cited art.

Therefore, applicant submits that Walker fails to anticipate claim 61.

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because

Walker teaches   <u>wherein further the user can transfer value from the at least one</u>

<u>account associated with the user to at least one account belonging to a second user</u>

Col. 11, lines 15-26, *where "returning the change to the buyer via his credit card*

account" reads on transferring value from one account to the second account).

Furthermore, the Examiner interpreted "transfer value from the at least one

account associated with the user to at least one account belonging to a second user" as

to as returning or refunding charge to the buyer credit card account from the seller

account.

Since the limitation of claim 61 has been addressed by Walker, the examiner's

rejection under 35 USC 102 is maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to SABA DAGNEW whose telephone number is (571)270-

3271. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert Weinhardt can be reached on (571) 272-6633. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 3688

/C. Michelle Tarae/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688